

[D R A F T]

DURHAM CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 4, 2026
DURHAM TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dwight Trueblood (Chair); Neil Slepian (Vice-Chair); Jacob Cragg, Anne Lightbody; Ben Phelps, Rob Sullivan (Planning Board Rep); Alternates: Steve Moyer and Julian Smith

MEMBERS ABSENT: Darrell Ford (Town Council Rep) and Alternate John Nachilly

ALSO PRESENT: Town Planner Michael Behrendt and Land Stewardship Coordinator Veronique Ludington

1 **I. Call to Order**

2 Chair Dwight Trueblood called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

3

4 **II. Land Acknowledgement Statement**

5 The Chair read the Land Acknowledgement Statement adopted by the town.

6

7 **III. Roll Call and Seating of Alternates**

8 The Chair welcomed Julian Smith as an alternate to the Commission. Roll call attendance was
9 taken and no alternates were seated.

10

11 **IV. Approval of Agenda**

12

13 *Chair Dwight Trueblood MOVED to approve the agenda as presented; SECONDED by Mr.*
14 *Cragg; APPROVED unanimously by a show of hands, 6-0, Motion carried.*

15 **V. Public Comments:**

16 Paul Rasmussen, 5 Glassford Lane, commented on the work of the [WSOD] subcommittees.
17 Speaking as a member of the Planning Board, he noted that Pettee Brook and College Brook
18 have a different setback in downtown than they do elsewhere. He suggested this kind of nuance
19 could be applied in other areas of town.

20

21 He said many RA neighborhoods have small lot sizes and wetlands can have a huge effect on
22 what homeowners can do with their properties. He mentioned one subdivision by route 4,
23 Bagdad Road extension, where there is space for a house, but most of the lot falls within the
24 setback, leaving little room for typical yard uses such as a swing set. Mr. Rasmussen suggested
25 that some flexibility or relief within the zoning – based on lot size or other criteria — could be

26 beneficial. He said Mr. Behrendt might help determine what would be fair and manageable for
27 the town. He also said without this flexibility, a resident adding a swing set and then having a
28 fallout with a neighbor could result in their actions being reported as a violation of the WSOD.
29 He encouraged the Commission to consider small lots in drafting the ordinance.
30

31 The Chair asked Mr. Rasmussen what lot sizes are in the RA district and he replied with his own
32 home as one example. He currently lives on 1/3 acre which is directly on Pettee Brook; the
33 buffer covers three-quarters of his property. He said lot size isn't the only consideration, it's
34 geometry as well. A rectangular lot 100 feet-wide with a creek on one side doesn't leave the
35 homeowner much room.
36

37 Vice-Chair Slepian asked Mr. Rasmussen if he's suggesting the Commission consider changing
38 buffers for small lots. Mr. Rasmussen said that would be one option, possibly restricted to certain
39 zones. Alternatively, if a buffer takes up a certain percentage on a specific lot size, then maybe a
40 different buffer size could kick in. He said there are many ways it could be handled and he can
41 work with it at the Planning Board.
42

43 In answer to a question, Mr. Rasmussen said if you consider two half-acre lots side-by-side – one
44 with a large buffer and the other with none – from an assessment viewpoint, the properties are
45 valued the same way even though restrictions on each homeowner are significantly different.
46

47 Mr. Smith said he agrees with Mr. Rasmussen. He owns a very small lot next to College Brook.
48 Mr. Smith then asked if he could address the Commission as a member of the public instead of
49 as a Commission member. After consulting with Mr. Behrendt, Chair Trueblood determined Mr.
50 Smith would be given the opportunity to speak under Other Business or Roundtable and not
51 under Public Comments.
52

53 VI. Land Stewardship Update

54 Land Stewardship Coordinator Veronique Ludington gave a report on recent activities:

- 55 • The Land Stewardship Subcommittee continues to work with a small sub-group on kiosk
56 and sign updates. They are developing content for the Doe Farm sign, while researching
57 design and production costs. She found a new vendor who will possibly work on the
58 kiosk for Wagon Hill Shoreland Restoration.
59
- 60 • She's continuing to work with Ann Welsh and Neil Slepian on the BioBlitz. Response
61 from experts has been good and a Save the Date poster is online; Facebook publicity and
62 registration will be handled by Rachel Gosowski, Parks & Rec; They are looking for
63 volunteers to help the day of the event, Sunday, May 17th. BioBlitz will also be promoted
64 in the new sustainability newsletter.
65
- 66 • She's hoping to recruit new trail stewards through a training next month and flyers and
67 articles in *Friday Updates* as well as in the sustainability newsletter.
68
- 69 • Ms. Ludington is working with Steve Letterman to design a Survey123 app for volunteers
70 to enter their hours, to allow for better tracking of total volunteer hours.

- 71 • Workdays planned for April include: cleanup and invasives removal at Milne Sanctuary
72 on Sat., April 18th. UNH capstone students currently working with Ann Lightbody will
73 staff a table that day about invasive removal after Mill Pond Dam removal. Scouts will do
74 trail cleanup at Doe Farm on April 25th. UNH math students will do a workday at Oyster
75 River Forest, date TBD.
- 76 • The next Discover Durham Trails walk is a snowshoe hike on March 15 at Longmarsh. A
77 UNH grad student will talk about stone walls, bridges, and other geological features. She
78 and Sara Callahan will talk about ecology and history of the site, with assistance from
79 Janet Mackie.
- 80 • Ms. Ludington and Neil Slepian met with Rich Reine and Sam Hewitt from DPW to
81 discuss Wagon Hill Farm shoreline restoration project and also invasives removal once
82 Mill Pond Dam comes down. DPW said mowing at Wagon Hill, which wasn't done this
83 past fall due to equipment failure, will be done this spring. They also discussed replacing
84 a bridge/boardwalk on the Oyster River Trail.
- 85 • She and Rachel Gasowski submitted an application for the 2026 AARP Community
86 Engagement Flagship Grant for accessibility improvements at Jackson's Landing.
87 Residents of Riverwoods provided valuable feedback and a letter of support. The request
88 for \$13,500 would buy materials to improve trails, add ADA-compliant picnic tables and
89 benches, as well as a shade canopy. The work would be done by volunteers and if grant-
90 funded, would need to be done by December 1, 2026.
- 91 • Re: Wagon Hill Farm (WH) dog waste issue previously discussed: she and Neil Slepian
92 met with Scott Letourneau, a Durham resident and head of Seacoast Dogs. He's
93 organized volunteers to pick up dog waste at WH, which she hopes will be an ongoing
94 effort. She's been distributing flyers in Wagon Hill parking lot and has heard from
95 residents who don't want the town to change its dog policies. Other town properties are
96 also becoming more littered with dog waste. Possibly more volunteers could get involved
97 at all public access properties.
- 98 • Great Bay Resource Protection Partnership Spring Stewardship grant was announced
99 recently. Applications due April 15th. She's working with Ted Howard on a possible
100 invasive mapping protocol at Doe Farm that has the potential to become an example for
101 the community at large. She is exploring the grant and project costs.

102
103
104 **VII. 561 Bay Road Permitted Use B.** Permitted Use B application for retaining walls, stone
105 walls, steps, regrading and landscaping within the Wetland Conservation Overlay District for a
106 single-family house. A Permitted Use B approval was granted in 2023 for a different design.
107 David and Karen Della Penta, property owners. Eric Weinrieb and Erik Saari, engineers, Altus
108 Engineering.

109
110 Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering and Lucy Humphreys from Matthew Cunningham
111 Landscape Design, came forward on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Weinrieb noted Devin
112 Hefferon, also with the landscape design company, was on zoom.

113 He noted the property under discussion is on Tax map 239, Lot 9 and owned by David and Karen
114 Della Penta through their trust. They last appeared before the Commission and Planning Board in
115 winter 2023.

116

117 Mr. Weinrieb said the site slopes from Bay Road at an elevation of 46 to 50 feet, down to an
118 elevation of 26 feet, near the wetland on eastern part of parcel. A former house on the property
119 was raised to allow construction of a new home with a state-of-the-art septic system.

120

121 He reviewed the 2023 approved plan, which included an elaborate retaining wall system to
122 address roughly 25 feet of grade change. Following Planning Board approval, the house was
123 raised, a well installed, and ledge removed for the foundation. Before footings were installed,
124 however, the Della Pentas paused construction. They decided the house was too large and also
125 that access from the house to the conservation area would be too difficult with about 20 steps.

126

127 They hired a new architect to design a more modest home and brought in Matthew Cunningham
128 Landscape Design to design a “less aggressive” wall system. Mr. Weinrieb said in 2023, they
129 filed a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for buffer impacts, but the Planning Board determined a
130 CUP was unnecessary and approved the project as Permitted Use B.

131

132 The property has historically been mowed into the wetlands. The revised plan removes a
133 retaining wall within 75-feet of the wetland and a shed within 60-feet.

134

135 Devin Hefferon of Matthew Cunningham Landscape Design (on zoom) then presented the
136 updated landscape plan. He said the Della Pentas asked the company to scale back the six
137 retaining walls previously planned and to adopt a more natural planted slope approach. Now in
138 their 70s and planning to age in place, the Della Pentas are seeking easier access to the
139 waterfront. The design uses a large stockpile of blasted ledge rock already on site and eliminates
140 the need for 1,900 cubic feet of concrete.

141

142 Mr. Hefferon showed slides with proposed topographical changes. The plan calls for 100 percent
143 native plants within the Overlay District and replaces the front lawn with a pollinator garden. He
144 noted the Della Pentas will no longer mow the lawn area to the prime wetland, a practice in place
145 for more than 20 years. He also outlined erosion control, stabilized construction access, and tree
146 protection measures. He said the revised plan is more site-sympathetic and safer long term.

147 Mr. Weinrieb then did a quick review of the purpose of the Wetland Conservation Overlay
148 District, items “a” through “f.” He believes the project meets the goals, including protecting
149 water quality, minimizing flooding, preserving habitat, maintaining ground water recharge, and
150 enhancing scenic value. He emphasized the proposed work is limited to the buffer.

151

152 Mr. Weinrieb stated they believe the application qualifies as a Permitted Use B under Section
153 175.60b of the ordinance. The project will include appropriate erosion and perimeter controls
154 outside the wetland buffer, as well as a stabilized construction exit to prevent sediment from
155 reaching roadways. Disturbed areas will be restored and improved by regrading slopes to reduce
156 concentrated runoff and enhance the natural wetland buffer. He added that all work will be

157 conducted to minimize impacts, noting that activities are limited to the buffer and will not affect
158 the wetland itself.

159 Vice-Chair Slepian said the project is well-designed but raised a concern brought up by Richard
160 Kelley from the Planning Board under 175.65A, which prohibits soil disturbance within 50-feet
161 of the reference line. Mr. Hefferon said the grading begins about 6 to 8 feet away from the
162 flagged wetland line.

163
164 Ms. Lightbody asked if the property falls under the WCOD [Wetland Conservation Overlay
165 District] or SPOD [Shoreland Protection Overlay District]. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed it's under
166 the WCOD; they're about 540 feet from the Bay.

167
168 Mr. Sullivan asked Mr. Weinrieb how they will address the ordinance calling for repair of the
169 retaining wall under Permitted Use B and Mr. Weinrieb replied they're proposing to take out the
170 existing retaining wall and change the grade to make it more natural. He said grading is
171 permitted where necessary to accommodate a structure.

172 Mr. Sullivan noted the new retaining wall is within the WCOD. He's concerned about the
173 potential cascade from adding three feet of dirt on the entire east side of the house. If the
174 Commission says it's okay to grade all the way down to the wetlands, it could set a precedent.
175 Mr. Weinrieb replied that every site is unique and that the design enhances the buffer.

176
177 There was continued back and forth discussion between Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Weinrieb about
178 potential impacts in the buffer and possible alternative approaches. Mr. Sullivan suggested they
179 could build a house without the lower half of the retaining wall and keep the grade a little
180 steeper. Mr. Weinrieb said the new design has fewer retaining walls, but the property would be
181 graded further down to the wetland. He believes this creates a better environmental solution
182 long-term.

183
184 Mr. Sullivan said there needs to be balance. He noted Mr. Weinrieb is arguing in the long run the
185 wetland will benefit by not having cement trucks on the road [to build more retaining walls],
186 while his own position is, "they're messing with the wetland buffer on a preference as opposed
187 to a necessity."

188 Mr. Hefferon presented a slide comparison of the original and revised designs, emphasizing the
189 retaining walls will not be visible from the Bay. Although the revised plan encroaches closer to
190 the wetland, he maintained that discontinuing mowing in that area represents a more sustainable,
191 ecologically sensitive approach.

192 Mr. Sullivan asked about access for aging homeowners. He questioned whether they would use
193 the path on the left or exit through the basement door, suggesting that if the basement door is the
194 primary access point, extensive grading along the lower portion of the retaining wall may not be
195 necessary. In response, Mr. Hefferon said the revised design allows access from a proposed deck
196 or a screened porch via three steps to the lawn, with a 12–14% grade—close to a standard ADA

197 ramp. He added that a retaining wall on the east side is needed to establish the slope and to
198 prevent encroachment into the tree root zone.

199 Mr. Smith, who has followed the project since its initial review by the Planning Board and has
200 visited the site, expressed support for the current proposal and the house design. He hopes the
201 Commission can get through the concerns raised by Mr. Sullivan.

202 Referencing Mr. Kelley's email, Vice-Chair Slepian again questioned how the project would
203 comply with the prohibition on soil disturbance within 50-feet of the reference line. Mr.
204 Weinrieb said he finds the ordinance language unclear and suggested that if it were interpreted
205 strictly, the town wouldn't be able to install culverts, for example. It seems that no wetland
206 permits would be issued. As written, he doesn't think this section of the ordinance applies in this
207 case.

208 Mr. Behrendt said while the new design is strong, the town must follow the ordinance. He noted
209 two challenging provisions related to this application: section 175.65A prohibits soil disturbance
210 within 50 feet of the reference line and another provision states grading needs to be tied to a
211 permitted use. The challenge for the Commission and Planning Board is to determine where the
212 allowance is in this case for extensive grading.

213 Chair Trueblood said the applicant may need to seek a variance from the Zoning Board. Mr.
214 Smith commented that requiring a well-designed project to delay construction for a ZBA hearing
215 sends the wrong message, adding that the town needs more development like this that is going to
216 create more tax revenue. He doesn't see a significant issue with the current proposal.

217 Mr. Sullivan reiterated his view that the revised plan, which pushes the design all the way to the
218 water, goes too far. Further discussion ensued about possible design modifications, with Mr.
219 Hefferon saying to eliminate any grading within 50-feet of the wetland, the wall on the eastern
220 side would have to curve inward to capture the slope. He noted it's achievable to pull the wall
221 back 50-feet, but difficult to remove all the earth work from 50 feet without having the wall cross
222 in front of the house. He acknowledged they will need to re-visit the plans.

223 Mr. Smith asked if it would be possible for the applicants to begin excavation and construction
224 of the house while landscape details are resolved. Mr. Weinrieb said they have a valid approval
225 in hand and since the house and septic are outside the buffer, construction could begin pending a
226 building permit.

227 Mr. Behrendt reiterated that any grading within 100 feet must be justified by a permitted use.
228 Chair Trueblood said the application does not appear to meet this standard, as the retaining wall
229 is not necessary to support the house. He again suggested seeking a variance. Mr. Behrendt
230 agreed and noted the Commission could provide input to the Zoning Board.

231 Mr. Hefferon asked for guidance on how to make revisions that would result in a
232 recommendation from the Commission. Mr. Sullivan said cutting the east wall in half and

233 steepening the grade would be a good starting point. The Chair said the project needs to provide
234 as much protection as possible from pollution, runoff, and sedimentation.

235
236 Mr. Behrendt said a variance would likely be needed for both disturbance within 50 feet and
237 grading not otherwise permitted. He advised the applicants to ask for what they want, noting they
238 will need to demonstrate hardship, based on specifics of the site.

239
240 Action Taken

241 The applicants were advised to seek a variance from the ZBA. Mr. Smith said he believes the
242 ZBA must hold a public hearing within 30 days of receiving the application and he sees no
243 reason construction of the house could not begin while they await a decision. Mr. Hefferon
244 added that timing is not a major concern.

245 Mr. Behrendt noted the ZBA's next meeting is April 14th, giving the applicants one to two
246 weeks to submit an application. If a variance is granted—and assuming the project qualifies as a
247 Permitted Use B—they will need to return to the Conservation Commission. In the interim, he
248 confirmed construction can start on the house.

249 The Chair said he would prefer to review the variance application before providing comments to
250 the ZBA. Ms. Lightbody suggested that, for stormwater management, the applicants consider
251 grading the slope to promote infiltration rather than creating a compacted lawn.

252 Chair Trueblood thanked the applicants for their presentation and the Commission then took a
253 brief recess.

254
255 **VIII. WSOD Discussion.** Update on subcommittee meetings about proposed Wetland and
256 Shoreland Overlay District.

257
258 The Chair introduced this item and said they need to discuss how they will address public
259 comments in the next ordinance draft.

260
261 Vice-Chair Neil Slepian gave a quick summary of the process over the last few months. He said
262 the Commission received a lot of public feedback and took it very seriously, compiling it in a
263 number of different formats. Recently, Mr. Behrendt put feedback into the pertinent sections of
264 the ordinance draft. Subcommittees have met and completed their work. The task now is to pull
265 together the work of the three subcommittees into a final proposal for the WSOD. He noted that
266 Mr. Cragg created an easy-to-read graphic that represents the graduated buffer proposal, starting
267 with the Chair's previous chart. He asked for subcommittees to give a five-minute report.

268
269 Mr. Cragg reported on the subcommittee for Conditional and Permitted Uses, which reviewed
270 sub-sections 175.62 and 63, 64 and 66. He said they considered all public feedback, but they
271 gave close point-by-point consideration to the proposal submitted by Durham residents on
272 December 14, 2025. The subcommittee's recommendations include:

- 273
274
- Reduce the size of the vegetative buffer (no numbers proposed).

- 275 • Allow limited use of slow-release, low phosphorus nitrogen fertilizers, pending
276 conversations with the entire Commission.
- 277 • Allow accessory structures located outside of the buffer as Permitted Use A. (They had
278 extensive discussion about this.)
- 279 • Allow free-standing solar systems as Permitted Use B. Residents recommended
280 Permitted Use A, but sub-committee thought it fell under Permitted Use B (along with
281 private wells and utilities).
- 282 • Change or remove language around fences since they are not detrimental to wildlife
283 corridors.
- 284 • Remove requirement for “best available technology” under 175.61d, pending further
285 conversations. They questioned why the language was there.
- 286 • More detailed descriptions are needed as to what constitutes agricultural and conservation
287 activities in 175.62.
- 288 • Based on last month’s discussion: they recommend reviewing language on Permitted Use
289 A, Permitted Use B, and Conditional Use overall.

290
291 Mr. Moyer reported on the work of the 175.61 (General Requirements for the Buffer) sub-
292 committee; He doesn’t believe they thought their work was done. They examined all public
293 comments and he noted Jim Lawson’s input was very helpful.

- 294
295 • The subcommittee agreed the idea of graduated buffers has merit and helps to address
296 many public concerns.
- 297 • They believe the “Why” document is important and offered suggestions to make the case
298 in a more compelling way. The environmental benefits need to be expanded, in their
299 view.
- 300 • The subcommittee also added to the FAQs for the website. Everything was sent to
301 members via email.

302
303 Mr. Sullivan asked Vice-Chair Slepian if there was justification for each of the graduated
304 buffers. He wants to be sure they have a basis for everything they propose. They need to be clear
305 if something is linked to state or federal law.

306
307 The Chair said when he created the buffer chart, he realized fourth order rivers and tidal waters
308 in Durham fall under the NH State Water Quality Protection Act. The Act has specific mandates
309 within 250 feet of the reference line. From 0-50 feet, e.g., there can be no fertilizers and no
310 cutting and there are strict guidelines for tree trimming, etc. He proposed the chart can be used as
311 a template for wetlands, vernal pools, and smaller streams and rivers. The Commission needs to
312 discuss how far inland they should go in regulating activities.

313 Chair Trueblood proposed creating a small working group to move the ordinance draft forward.
314 Along with himself and Vice-Chair Slepian for continuity, he would like someone from the
315 Planning Board and Town Council to be part of the group, as well as Mr. Behrendt. They will
316 meet twice monthly during the day.

317 After the working group comes up with another draft, it will be brought back to the Conservation
318 Commission for further discussion. The Chair said he's unsure how to engage the public at that
319 point to assure them their concerns have been addressed.

320

321 Mr. Sullivan asked if they should have a member of the public in the working group and Vice-
322 chair Slepian said he believes they've incorporated sufficient public comment into all of their
323 work and it would be difficult to choose just one representative from the public. He advocates for
324 another public session once the sub-group comes back with an updated draft.

325

326 Mr. Behrendt reiterated the sub-group will meet every two weeks during the day. They will hold
327 advertised public meetings. Minutes will be one page maximum, not detailed. More detailed
328 minutes will be done when the sub-group comes back to the larger Commission. Vice-Chair
329 Slepian said they can update the Conservation Commission monthly, if they wish.

330

331 It was clarified that the working group will be comprised of Darryl Ford (Town Council Rep);
332 Rob Sullivan (Planning Board Rep); Chair Dwight Trueblood; Vice-Chair Neil Slepian, and
333 Town Planner Michael Behrendt.

334

335 **IX. Review of Minutes: December 22, 2025**

336

337 Mr. Cragg said the number of members approving the agenda was questioned by the minute
338 taker. He noted the number should be six.

339

340 ***Chair Trueblood MOVED to approve the December 22, 2025 minutes as amended;***
341 ***SECONDED by Mr. Phelps; APPROVED, 3-0-3, with Anne Lightbody, Neil Slepian and Rob***
342 ***Sullivan abstaining.***

343

344 X. Other Business

345 Newly-appointed alternate Julian Smith was given the opportunity to introduce himself. He said
346 he has lived in Durham off and on since 1965 and was a UNH professor. He studied at Tulane
347 and Columbia Universities and managed to become a fully-tenured professor without a PhD. He
348 served a total of ten years on the Commission, as a Planning Board Rep. Mr. Smith said Town
349 Council interviewed him this past Monday before appointing him to the Commission. He
350 commented the Council wasn't happy about his application and he was told he would likely not
351 be approved. They had a lengthy discussion and the vote was 5-4. Vice-Chair Slepian asked why
352 the vote was so close and Mr. Smith replied because he is seen as a "troublemaker." He adopts
353 contrarian positions and asks too many questions. He cited several examples of ways he's
354 challenged the status quo.

355 Mr. Moyer advised Mr. Smith to get to know others on the Commission and listen to what they
356 have to say. Secondly, he cautioned that time is one of their greatest resources and they have to
357 use it wisely.

358 Turning to other topics, Mr. Cragg asked if the format he created for the graduated buffer chart
359 was workable for everyone. He used Canva and allowed text boxes to be editable. It was agreed
360 the new sub-group will do their own edits.

361

362 Reporting on the submission for the Sustainability Newsletter, Mr. Cragg said he drafted an
363 introductory article of less than 200 words. It focuses on their work, partners, and the WSOD. He
364 wanted to be sure they aren't duplicating what was submitted by the Land Stewardship
365 Committee. Members are asked to submit comments/feedback by Monday.

366

367 Mr. Cragg also reported on blurbs he created for the Conservation Corner in *Friday Updates*. He
368 said wetlands have been mentioned many times and he asked members to let him know of any
369 redundancies. He asked for members to submit new topics. He has maintained a list of sources
370 for those who have questions. He mentioned that Town Administrator Selig has asked about data
371 collection, re: if articles are being read. Mr. Cragg said he believes people are seeing the articles
372 because he's heard some discussion about them. He would like to start gathering data on the
373 Conservation Commission's work in general, including special events.

374

375 X. Roundtable

376 Chair Trueblood reported he and Vice-Chair Neil Slepian received an invitation today to be on a
377 panel at the NH Lakes Symposium in Concord to discuss the process used to develop the new
378 ordinance for the Wetland and Shoreland Overlay District.

379

380 Mr. Sullivan asked Mr. Behrendt if there had been any progress to the Technology Drive project
381 and he replied he thinks they're applying for a variance soon. Mr. Sullivan said it's going to be a
382 big deal for the Commission, in terms of addressing water quality for the town. His guess is that
383 it could come back to the Commission within six months.

384

385 Reporting on Planning Board activity, Mr. Sullivan said there's a lot of discussion about zoning
386 changes associated with the Housing Task Force. Potentially there could be lot size changes,
387 which might drive a lot of projects to the Conservation Commission.

388

389 XI. Adjournment

390 ***With no further business, Chair Trueblood MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.;***

391 ***SECONDED by Mr. Cragg, APPROVED unanimously, 6-0, Motion carried.***

392

393 Respectfully submitted,

394 Lucie Bryar, Minutes Taker

395 Town of Durham Conservation Commission